CCmm_035

From:

kira kilmer <chilipepper@xmission.com>

To:

<dfinerfrock@utah.gov>

Date:

1/26/2010 9:12 PM

Subject:

depleted uranium shipments to Utah

My comments address responsibility of policy makers to anticipate all aspects of your decisions regarding the importation of uranium materials..

1. Energy Solutions may not last as long as the problems they create.

Lehman Brothers and Enron would not have anticipated their own demise.

The responsibility for mitigation of problems could fall to Utah,

or to all taxpaying US citizens

smaller government?

if Superfund Clean-up funds are necessary--do we want bigger or

Is it fair to gloss over problems and expect taxpayers to bail you

out?

Would "clean-up" even be possible? What if an aquifer were

contaminated?

2. Energy Solutions is not going to advertise their own shortcomings

just as the tobacco

industry told us cigarettes tasted good and were either masculine

or sophisticated

but did not admit the cigarettes were addictive and that use

exposed smokers to carcinogens

3. Storage is only one of several concerns. What about transportation? Carrying containers across

the country exposes all those along the route to potential

contamination, either

by intentional spilling or accidental hazard. In Salt Lake the

train route goes

through the heart of the city. Can you afford an accident or

terrorist incident in our

metropolitan center? Would you want an incident in any other city

or rural farmland?

4. What about worker exposure to toxic materials? The Energy

Solutions executives will sit at their

desks, but the so called jobs they create may come with the

inherent risk of deadly exposure

should any containers fail or should there be workplace errors in

handling the containers.

5. And finally, should not you, the legislature, the governor and all

of us as the society who support you, be thinking

e thinking of the final results. To meet our growing energy needs, should we

agree to working with poisons or look

to sources that are sustainable and non-toxic? Do we want mercury

in our water? Petroleum, lead and arsenic

in our air, uranium in our dust and possibly in our water, or

should we push ahead with solar, wind, geothermal

energy sources, and conservation, while our research teams try to

solve the known negative consequences of

nuclear materials and coal.

We ask the coca growers in Colombia to give up a chance for income,

we ask the opium growers in Afghanistan

to grow grain at much lower profits, surely we can ask ourselves:

are a few jobs worth the risk of accident, risks to

employee and citizen health and potential damage to our environment?

D. K. Kilmer, 1012 South 800 East, Salt Lake City.